



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 7

GIBBONS, DEL DEO, DOLAN, GRIFFINGER & VECCHIONE
1 RIVERFRONT PLAZA
NEWARK, NJ 07102-5497

COPY MAILED

MAR 02 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

ON PETITION

In re Application of :
Tharmalingam Ratnarajah :
Application No. 09/748,329 :
Filed: December 26, 2000 :
Attorney Docket No. NTL-3.2.161/3599 (13099RO):

This is a decision on the petition, filed November 29, 2004, to revive the above-identified application under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b).

The petition is **GRANTED**.


The application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the non-final Office action mailed March 12, 2004. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on September 27, 2004. In response, on November 29, 2004, an amendment and the present petition were filed.

37 CFR 1.137(b)(3) requires a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. While it is not apparent whether the person signing the statement of unintentional delay was in a position to have firsthand or direct knowledge of the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and circumstances of such delay. See 37 CFR 10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997). In the event that such an inquiry has not been made, petitioner must make such an inquiry. If such inquiry results in the discovery that it is not correct that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. However, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.34(a), the signature of Richard M. Lehrer appearing on the petition shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that he is authorized to represent the particular party on whose behalf he acts. While it is noted that a change of correspondence address to address noted in the petition has been filed, it is not acceptable since it does not appear to be signed by a proper party. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to petitioner. However, if Mr. Lehrer desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted. All future correspondence regarding this application file will be directed solely to the address of record.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3204. All other inquiries regarding this application should be directed to the Technology Center.

The application file is being forwarded to Technology Center 2600, Art Unit 2637.



Sherry D. Brinkley
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy

cc: RICHARD M. LEHRER
MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY
& POPEO, PC
THE CHRYSLER CENTER
666 THIRD AVEUE, 24TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10017